

**From:** [Dave STONE](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** [Chip\\_Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Subject:** Re: DHS Lamprey Results  
**Date:** 05/09/2006 08:15 AM

---

Not sure what the limitations are that they are referring to. Was it CTSI members or their consultants?

Perhaps 4 composites seems like a low number to them? Or, do they want individual lamprey analyses to better infer variability on contaminant load? Or perhaps there is some new chemical on the block that I did not analyze (although I can't speculate what that would be). If I were eating the lamprey, I would want to test smoked vs. unsmoked to determine the % loss of organics after cooking.

While I think efforts could be directed elsewhere, it would be interesting to get a third data set, spanning over 10 years, from Willamette Falls. We clearly showed in the last sampling event that PCB levels had fallen dramatically from the CRITFC sampling (although some did not want to hear that message).

-Dave

>>> <Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov> 5/8/2006 6:37 PM >>>

Dave, last week, Chip and I went down and met with the Siletz tribe. One of the Siletz's concerns is the public health effects associated with consumption of lamprey. We discussed the lamprey data that had been collected a few years ago at Willamette Falls. They indicated that the samples collected previously (4 composites, 30 samples per composite) had some limitations. Can you shed some light on your view of the lamprey data and where it may fall short?

Thanks, Eric